UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,676	06/12/2006	John Alan Gervais	PU030342	4964
	7590 10/19/201 d, Patent Operations	EXAMINER		
THOMSON Lic P.O. Box 5312		MOORTHY, ARAVIND K		
Princeton, NJ 0	8543-5312		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2492	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/19/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/582,676	GERVAIS ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
ARAVIND K. MOORTHY	2492		

	7400011001		
The MAILING DATE of this communic	ation appears on the cover she	et with the corresponde	ence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>24 September 2010</u> FAILS TO F	LACE THIS APPLICATION IN C	CONDITION FOR ALLOW	ANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but pr application, applicant must timely file one of the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance periods:	e following replies: (1) an amendi iice of Appeal (with appeal fee) ir	ment, affidavit, or other evin compliance with 37 CFR	idence, which places the 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from	n the mailing date of the final rejection	n.	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing on event, however, will the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing of the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing of the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing of the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing of the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing of the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing of the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing of the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing of the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing of the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing of the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing of the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing of the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the	eply expire later than SIX MONTHS f r box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX	from the mailing date of the fir	nal rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MI Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C NOTICE OF APPEAL). The date on which the petition und period of extension and the correspondate of the shortened statutory perions Office later than three months after	onding amount of the fee. The differ reply originally set in the	e appropriate extension fee final Office action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A br	ief in compliance with 37 CFR 41	1.37 must be filed within tw	o months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), on Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must AMENDMENTS	or any extension thereof (37 CFR	R 41.37(e)), to avoid dismis	ssal of the appeal. Since a
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final (a) They raise new issues that would require (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see 	further consideration and/or sea		ntered because
(c) They are not deemed to place the applic appeal; and/or	ation in better form for appeal by		plifying the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without control NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and		or finally rejected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 3	* **	ce of Non-Compliant Ame	ndment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following in	ejection(s):		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s)v non-allowable claim(s).		•	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendr how the new or amended claims would be reje The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follo Claim(s) allowed: 10-13. Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-9. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	cted is provided below or append		and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a fina because applicant failed to provide a showing was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116 	of good and sufficient reasons wh		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the dientered because the affidavit or other evidence showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is 	e failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections	s under appeal and/or appe	ellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	explanation of the status of the o	laims after entry is below	or attached.
The request for reconsideration has been cor See Continuation Sheet.	sidered but does NOT place the	application in condition for	r allowance because:
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Sta</i>13. ☐ Other:	rement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper N	o(s)	
	/Aravind K N	Moorthy/	
		miner, Art Unit 2492	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that Freeman is directed towards a technique for securely changing encryption keys. The applicant argues that although both use encryption, Freeman's technique has little applicability to the conditional access systems described in the present specification. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Freeman discloses that once a user has had access to a particular set of encrypted files, several prior art approaches exist for securely removing that access. These prior art approaches include: 1) changing the key-pair for the cryptographic file-set, 2) changing the symmetric encryption key for new writes, and 3) re -encrypting the entire file-set for which access rights have changed. Each of these approaches has drawbacks. Simply changing the key-pair that encrypts the symmetric file encryption key is not secure because no means exists for verifying that a user did not cache the symmetric file encryption key, which would allow access not only to previously stored information, but new information as well. Changing the symmetric encryption keys that are used for newly stored information provides some protection, but a user can still access all of the previously stored information in the cryptographic file-set. This solution has the additional disadvantage that there may eventually be many encryption keys needed to read a single file, which makes the system overly complex. The most secure solution is to re-encrypt the entire cryptographic file system when a user's access to the file-set is removed. While the most secure, this method is also very costly, especially if user access rights change frequently. A Secure Key Replacement Protocol (SKRP), as described below, provides a safe and convenient way to change access rights [0030]. The applicant argues nowhere does March teach or suggest that the feature of an access card having a write-once memory and paired with a destination device. The examiner respectfully disagrees. March teaches a write-once memory [0037]. March teaches that the data can only be written into the memory device by only the manufacturer of the device [0025]. Therefore, the manufacturer is paired with the memory device. The applicant argues that Freeman fails to disclose or suggest conditional access data and conditional access certificates. The examiner respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, Freeman discloses conditional access data. Freeman discloses that the certificate has a validity date [0028]. Since the certificate has a validity date (conditional time), Freeman discloses conditional access certificates...